

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

IVAN RENE MOORE,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 12-C-647

**JERREL JONES, ERNESTINE JONES,
ERNEST JONES, COURIER COMMUNICATIONS,
SANDRA ROBINSON, DAVE JANZER,
HOMER BLOW McCARTER, MARY ELLEN STRONG,
and MARK B, also known as CUSTOM DESIGNS,**

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

On March 2, 2013, the Court entered judgment dismissing this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on the grounds that one of the defendants, Mary Ellen Strong, was a nondiverse, indispensable party. The plaintiff, Ivan Rene Moore, now moves for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), arguing that Ms. Strong is neither diverse nor indispensable (in fact, she is apparently dead). Moore requests leave to amend so he can drop Ms. Strong from his complaint, thus curing the jurisdictional deficiency.

In a separate case, the Court rejected Moore's attempt to bring a third-party complaint against the above-captioned defendants because the allegations therein did not state a plausible claim for relief. *Wells Fargo v. Moore, et al.*, Case No. 12-C-271 (E.D. Wis.).

Moore's allegations in this case are not exactly the same, but they tell the same basic story of conspiracy and persecution to damage Moore's business interests. As in that case, Moore's allegations do not present a story that "holds together." *Engel v. Buchan*, 710 F.3d 698, 709 (7th Cir. 2013); *Cooney v. Rossiter*, 583 F.3d 967, 971 (7th Cir. 2009) (before subjecting defendants to "paranoid pro se litigation . . . alleging . . . a vast, encompassing conspiracy," the plaintiff must meet a "high standard of plausibility"). Since Moore cannot state any plausible claims for relief, the Court will not allow him to attempt to establish subject matter jurisdiction through a corrected pleading.

Moore's motion for reconsideration [ECF No. 19] is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 8th day of May, 2013.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge